



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/571,503	03/10/2006	Jean-Yves Bitterlich	03869.105774	4152
86528	7590	04/28/2010		
King & Spalding LLP 401 Congress Avenue Suite 3200 Austin, TX 78701		EXAMINER PHANTANA ANGKOOK, DAVID		
		ART UNIT 2175		PAPER NUMBER
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE 04/28/2010 ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

AustinUSPTO@kslaw.com
AustinIP@kslaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/571,503	Applicant(s) BITTERLICH, JEAN-YVES
	Examiner David Phantana-angkool	Art Unit 2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 February 2010.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 4-12, 14, 16, and 18 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 4-12, 14, 16, and 18 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/88/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application has been reassigned to Examiner David Phantana-angkool.
2. This action is responsive to Amendments filed on February 16th, 2010.
3. Claims 4-12, 14, 16, and 18 are pending in the case. Claims 4, 7, and 10 are independent claims.
4. Applicants amended claims 4, 7, 10, 14, 16, and 18.
5. Applicants canceled claims 13, 15, and 17.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. **The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:**

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. **Claims 4-12, 14, 16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Saka, US# 7,519,910 (hereinafter Saka).**

As for independent claim 4:

Saka shows a method for generating an object processing platform between an object computer and a processing computer, wherein an ad hoc screen assembly is performed by the object computer with the processing computer to couple a respective input and/or output device, comprising of:

- *generating an assembled display combining at least a portion of a display belonging to the object computer and at least a portion of a display belonging to the processing computer* (Saka in Figure 12 and column 7, lines 15-20 show a user interface displaying a portion of a display of a local machine desktop and a remote machine desktop),

- *activating at the object computer a local file processing function on the processing computer* (7:37-42, Saka shows the user activating at the object computer a local file processing function),
- *generating an object processing platform by moving an object from the portion of the assembled display belonging to the object computer to an interaction area of the portion of the assembled display belonging to the processing computer* (Figure 12 shows the interaction area where the user can copy a file from one computer to another by selecting the desired file or icon, see 7:15-20 and 7: 37-42).
- *wherein activating the local file processing function comprises moving the object from the object computer to the interaction area* (7:37-42);
- *wherein the object computer is configured to generate a local object computer graphical user interface (GUI); wherein the processing computer is configured to generate a local processing computer GUI; and wherein as a result of generating the assembled display at least a portion of the local object computer GUI is displayed on the display belonging to the processing computer* (Saka shows the user copying files from a remote machine desktop to local machine desktop by moving the respective icons from remote machine desktop to local machine desktop in column 7, lines 42-47. Figure 12 shows a portion of both local and remote machine desktops at the same time).

As for dependent claim 5:

Saka shows *the method according to claim 4, further, comprising an application-specific processing of the object is started by a further coupling of the object to an application icon on the display belonging to the processing computer* (7: 37-47)

As for dependent claim 6:

Saka shows *the method according to claim 5, wherein object-computer-specific data of the object is converted into application-specific data* (7:37-47 and 7:53-64)

As for independent claim 7:

Claim 7 contains similar substantial subject matter as claimed in independent claim 4, and is respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

As for dependent claims 8 and 9:

Claims 8 and 9 contain similar substantial subject matter as claimed in claims 5 and 6, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

As for independent claim 10:

Claim 10 contains similar substantial subject matter as claimed in independent claim 4, and is respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

As for dependent claims 11 and 12:

Claims 11 and 12 contain similar substantial subject matter as claimed in claims 5 and 6, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

As for dependent claim 14:

The method according to claim 4, wherein moving the object from the portion of the assembled display belonging to the object computer to the interaction area of the portion of the assembled display belonging to the processing computer automatically causes the display belonging to the processing computer to switch from displaying the at least a portion of the local object computer GUI to displaying the local processing computer GUI (Since Figure 12 shows a portion of both local and remote machine desktops at the same time, Saka teaches displaying the at least a portion of the local object computer GUI to displaying the local processing computer GUI).

As for dependent claims 16 and 18:

Claims 16 and 18 contain similar substantial subject matter as claimed in claim 14, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 4-12, 14, 16, and 18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. While the last Office Action indicated allowable subject matter, the newly updated search reveals Saka reference, US# 7,519,910 B2. Therefore, at this time, all of the instant claims remain rejected.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Phantana-angkool whose telephone number is 571-272-2673. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:00-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on 571-272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DP
/David Phantana-angkool/
Examiner, Art Unit 2175

/William L. Bashore/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175